

REMARKS

Claims 1-112 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated March 22, 2007, claims 1-112 were rejected. Applicants address the Examiner's comments below. Applicants are amending claims 1 and 78 in this Amendment and Response. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 15-16, 35, 47, 50, 65, 78, 92-93, and 112 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,056 to Steele in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama. This rejection is now traversed.

Representative claim 78, as amended, recites:

A method for printing time-based media, the method comprising:
receiving time-based media data from a media source;
receiving a user selection of a multimedia function from a plurality of selectable multimedia functions, the multimedia function to be applied automatically to time-based media data;
performing, by a multifunction printer, the multimedia function on the time-based media data to automatically identify a portion of the time-based media data to be printed to a tangible medium based on identification criteria received from a user;
displaying a representation of the time-based media including a timeline of the time-based media indicating a location of the identified portion along the timeline, the representation updating responsive to the user changing the identification criteria;
printing the identified portion of the time-based media data; and
producing an electronic output of the identified portion of the time-based media data.

A multifunction printer allows a user to select from among a plurality of multimedia functions to be performed on time-based media. Examples of functions that can be performed are illustrated in FIG. 4 and FIG. 5. The selected multimedia function automatically identifies a portion of the time-based media to be printed to a tangible medium based on identification criteria received from a user (for example, a confidence threshold controlled by a slider control). The identified portion is updated responsive to the user changing the identification criteria. A representation of the time-based media is displayed including a timeline indicating the location of the identified portion. The representation is updated as the user changed the identification criteria. The identified portion is then printed and outputted electronically. Thus, the claimed invention allows a user to preview which portions of the time-based media are identified by the multimedia function prior to printing.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest at least the step of displaying a representation of the multimedia function including a timeline indicating the location of the identified portion. Sugiyama discloses a video printer that allows a user viewing a video to select frames for printing. In order to print an image, the user selects a memory key 21 to freeze a displayed image and then initiates printing with a print key 23. (col. 4, lines 45-54). Sugiyama fails to disclose or suggest displaying a representation of the time-based media including a timeline indicating the location of the identified portion. Furthermore, Sugiyama fails to disclose or suggest updating the representation responsive to the user changing the identification criteria. Rather, such a display would be of no use to a user of Sugiyama because the frames to print are

specifically selected by the user. Thus, the user would not need to preview the portion identified by a multimedia function.

Steele is not directed to a printer. Rather, Steele discloses a system for video browsing on the World Wide Web. A user is provided with thumbnails of a video image. By selecting a pair of the thumbnails, a new set of thumbnails is generated. The new set of thumbnails comprise frames of the video temporally between chosen pair. This allows the user to narrow the time frame of thumbnails being looked at, in order to locate a particular portion of the video. (See, e.g., col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 21.) Steele fails to provide the features missing from Sugiyama. Although Steele displays a set of thumbnails, Steele does not disclose displaying a representation that includes a timeline indicating a location of the identified portion along the timeline. Furthermore, Steele fails to disclose or suggest updating the representation responsive to the user changing the identification criteria. Rather, thumbnails are identified in Steele by detecting scene cuts (Steele, col. 3 line 67) and are unrelated to any identification criterion from a user. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 78 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 1 is patentable over Sugiyama and Steele for at least the same reasons as above. As claims 15-16, 35, 47, 50, 65, 78, 92-93 and 112 depend from claim 1 or 78, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 and 78 also apply to claims 15-16, 35, 47, 50, 65, 78, 92-93 and 112. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 15-16, 35, 47, 50, 65, 78, 92-93 and 112 are also patentable over Steele and Sugiyama for at least the same reasons recited above.

In the 5th-21th paragraphs of the Office Action, the remaining dependent claims have further been rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Steele and Ishikawa in various combinations with U.S. Patent No. 6,118,888 to Chino; U.S. Patent No. 5,091,948 to Kametani; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101513 A1 to Halverson; U.S. Patent No. 6,611,622 B1 to Krumm; U.S. Patent No. 6,594,377 B1 To Kim; U.S. Patent No. 5,568,406 to Gerber; U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1 to Hymel; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 A1 to Stevens; U.S. Patent No. 6,296,693 B1 to McCarthy; U.S. Patent No. 5,115,967 to Wedekind; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0003846 A1 to Rowe; and U.S. Patent No. 6,373,498 B1 to Abgrall.

The cited references each fail to disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations previously discussed. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite additional elements that also are patentably distinguishable from all cited combinations of the above references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to the remaining dependent claims and withdraw them.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks Applicants submit that claims 1-112 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections to the claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter E. Hart *et al.*

Date: January 14, 2008

By: /Jason E. Amsel/
Jason E. Amsel, Patent Agent
Reg. No. 60,650
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7692
Fax: (650) 938-5200